

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 19, 2004. Claims 42-45 and 54-64 are presented for examination, of which Claims 42, 43, 44, 45 and 54 are in independent form. Claims 42-45 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 54-64 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1-41 and 46-53 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the indication at pages 16-18 of the Office Action that Claims 46 and 47 would be allowable if rewritten so as not to depend from a rejected claim, and with no change in scope. The recitation of Claim 46 has been incorporated into Claim 45, which accordingly is deemed to be allowable. In addition, as discussed below, the Examiner's suggestion has been adopted in the drafting of the newly added claims.

In the Office Action, Claims 34-44 and 48-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,288,485 B1 (Takegami et al.), and Claim 45

was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from that patent in view of U.S.

Patents 6,064,125 (Stendardo et al.) and 5,751,925 (Kataoka et al.).

Cancellation of Claims 34-41 and 48-53 renders the rejection of those claims moot.

Independent Claim 42 is directed to an image display apparatus that comprises a display panel for displaying an image, a scanning circuit for supplying a scanning signal to the display panel, and a modulation circuit for supplying a modulation signal to the display panel. Also provided is a control circuit for outputting a signal for stopping output of the signal from the scanning circuit and/or the modulation circuit to the display panel, where supply of power to the scanning circuit and/or the modulation circuit is stopped in a state in which the output of the signal from the scanning circuit and/or the modulation circuit to the display panel is stopped by the signal for stopping in turning off a power source while an image based on a video signal is displayed by outputting a signal from the scanning circuit and/or the modulation circuit to the display panel.

Thus, Claim 42 has been amended to clarify that the image display apparatus is displaying an image based on a video signal at the time the stopping is performed. For the following reasons, this is believed clearly to distinguish this claim from

Takegami

Takegami has been adequately discussed in previous papers, and it is not deemed necessary to repeat that discussion in full. Applicants note that the Examiner states at pages 10 and 11 of the Office Action that *Takegami* discloses stopping supply of power to the scanning circuit and/or the modulation circuit, referring to col. 15, lines 13-28, of *Takegami*. Applicants find that they cannot agree with the Examiner, because the description pointed out in the Office Action is directed to a method of manufacturing an electron source rather than to the displaying of an image using the finished product. The mentioned recitation in Claim 42 is believed to make clear that that claim does not refer to the method of manufacture of a device. Accordingly, Applicants believe that Claim 42 is clearly allowable over *Takegami*.

Independent Claims 43 and 44 are each deemed allowable over *Takegami* by virtue of at least the points made above with regard to Claim 42.

Newly added independent Claim 54 is based on Claim 45 but includes the recitation of Claim 47, which is indicated as being allowable by the examiner.

Accordingly, Claim 54 is deemed to be in condition for allowance.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as

references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 476825v1